

April 7, 1976

PRESIDENT: Well there is the possibility that the pay raise for that judge would go into effect.

SENATOR MURPHY: ... and all others.

PRESIDENT: That could be, yes sir. That will require more money, but this particular bill appropriated no money.

SENATOR MURPHY: I don't know how you do that.

PRESIDENT: Maybe it should have, but it did not and therefore doesn't require 30 votes.

SENATOR MURPHY: Does that mean then that they will not receive their salaries?

PRESIDENT: I'm sure there will be a deficit appropriations bill.

SENATOR MURPHY: There we go. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Yes sir. Anything else, Senator Murphy, while you're on your feet?

SENATOR MURPHY: Yes, would you hurry on with the Final Reading.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: I was just going to support Senator Duis' suggestion back to Senator Kelly's motion which I guess is what's pending. It would seem to me there is nothing wrong with either sending 182 over in the event the Governor does not like 987 there is still something left; or at the minimum I would hope that we could hold the bill. If it is correct, as I understood, that all bills will be back before we adjourn today or maybe now that we've extended it that won't be the case. In any event I don't think that 182 ought to be indefinitely postponed. I would urge that perhaps Senator Kelly could just withdraw the motion and let it go.

PRESIDENT: Senator Luedtke.

SENATOR LUEDTKE: Mr. President, members of the Legislature. It was understood that if 987 passed, in the first place, 182, as I've indicated before, should never come up until 987 The idea was that it would follow 987. There's no need for it, in fact it's inconsistent with 987. You then force the Governor to veto one or the other. He's got enough vetoes on the record now. I don't want to give him another one. He'd have to veto one or the other because you cannot have both of them, they are inconsistent. They have inconsistent boards. I think it would be totally irresponsible on our part to send both of those over there. I think.... We don't have to compound the problems we've got now by doing that. I think we can very simply bring this back, reconsider it and then not pass it. Then we've taken care of the matter as we said we would. I am in favor of Senator Kelly's motion to bring it back and to undo what we did.